humanist-inspired education of post-Reformation England.

Mulcaster is the champion of talent, the vernacular, the education of girls; a defender of public schools, of conferences between teachers, parents and neighbours, of teacher training in the universities, and a host of other progressive causes.

All this is nice to read about again, but beyond that what can one say? The question keeps recurring: is it really worthwhile to truncate a moderately sized book of interest to a reasonably sophisticated clientele? Despite its identification with future themes in British education, the *Positions* is a treatise with values more documentary than intrinsic; some of its basic usefulness is inevitably destroyed by even the most cautious knife. Surely, too, a student in history or English could find his way through its Elizabethan spelling and print, or at least he should, with a gentle shove from a learned preface to send him on his way.

In other words, a photographic copy of the original text of the *Positions* with an introduction would likely best serve the needs of most of its potential readers. Yet this is not what the market gives us. Rather in one and the same year it offers us this abridgment with an introduction, and by the hand of another publisher, Da Capo, an integral text without one! In the reprint industry the fallout from incoordinate blasts of activity continues relatively unabated. It should begin to trouble the partisans of uncluttered academic air.

Moreover, that integral reprinting can be done attractively and cheaply has been proven by the Scolar Press in England. Perhaps the editor of the commendable series "Classics in Education" would now do them one better by issuing unabridged texts of treatises such as Mulcaster's, photomechanically reproduced, with comments of a kind which, like Mr. DeMolen's, grace so many of its volumes.

JAMES S. HOCKLEY, *The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*

Nathaniel Culverwell. *An Elegant and Learned Discourse of the Light of Nature.* Ed. Robert A. Greene and Hugh MacCallum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. Pp. lvii, 216. $10.

Greene, MacCallum and the University of Toronto Press have combined to provide a handsome setting for Culverwell's 157-page-copious declamation. Not only physically fine, the book shows in its make-up thoughtful design for easy and satisfactory use. The forty-odd pages of notes have running keys to the page-numbers of origin. Square bracketed translations appear after those of Culverwell's quotations which he himself does not translate; this just might be supererogatory for readers with any interest in Culverwell, but better to err on the side of communication. The notes assay at a high density of information and occasional analysis. Note 64/p. 184, for example, reveals that what Culverwell has cited as "Vasquez" is a phrase of summary by Suarez of Vasquez on Aquinas. Similarly, his "sacred Oratour" might more properly have been styled something like 'Jewish sage,' since he *means* Philo, whose collocation with Chrysostom on a page of Grotius registered only approximately in Culverwell's mind (n.16/p. 191). A note rich in scholarship suggests that a term Culverwell misattributes to Aristotle, *ὀν ὀντων*, represents a fusion of a Platonic term with "the Biblical trope 'king of kings'" (n. 11/p. 179). That last invites questions as to whether

evidence might be accumulated, evidence of creatively transforming power in Culverwell's imagination.

Yet complaints of omission must be registered, though different readers will weigh them very differently. If the editors are just in praising Culverwell for vigour of metaphor and humanistic assertion (pp. xxvi, xlv, xlvi), then why not index images and topic? "Candle of the Lord" (11 + 49 entries) is the only index item I find which is not a proper name or title. Similarly, but more seriously, the editors restrict their expertise to somewhat intramural considerations.

This second omission may not be objectionable in the notes, and does not figure in the introductory material on biography, genealogy, or the text, perhaps not in "The Discourse and the Context of Religious Controversy" (if that topic be construed narrowly). But in the treatment of "Culverwell and Bacon," of "Voluntarism and Innate Ideas," of "the Whichcote-Tuckney Debate," and of the generic questions in "The form and Argument of the *Discourse*," one can feel – I feel – that considerable scholarly acuity has been regrettably parochialized. The editors do advert to recent arguments that any amalgam of voluntarism and natural law from immutable nature is untenable, but they do not comment on the argument nor on the significant fact "that Suarez, Culverwell, and Locke all felt constrained to assert" some such compromise (xxvii).

Not that the multitudinous opportunities for critical analysis would do much for Culverwell's attractiveness if they were seized. The editors are impeccable in what they choose to do, and they term him "essentially a Protestant blossom on the scholastic tree" (xxiii). "Which some call nature's bastards," one might add, after noting his way with abstraction, with concreteness, and with personal presence.

I suspect that the three ways are all one, are phases of some thinness or division in the self, but I cannot define it, and the familiar distinctions have their convenience. His way with abstractions is to treat them like spatial things, and to postulate them relentlessly like a grandiose picket fence – a shaky one, since his conclusions are often non sequiturs and his terms are rarely anchored to anything except other similar terms, to nothing solidly shareable in experience outside his own psyche. This can be noted in his chapter on "The Light of Reason" with its bootless expatiation of the scholastic hypothecation that the intellect by itself is never deceived – or in any other chapter.

His metaphors, analogies, and proportions, on the other hand, have usually been curiously abstracted from lived experience; they tend to be treated like concepts with deductive validity and certainty, their concreteness no more assimilated to the work's movement than bells and pomegranates in the margins of a logarithm table. It is so in the "Light of Reason" chapter with *glosse, Pen, heightning,* and *reprinting.* It is so in a pseudo-explanation wherein he substitutes a question-begging image for Edward Herbert's "somewhat cloudy" and question-begging abstraction (p. 83).

A lively passage of invective (pp. 61-63) compares not unfavourably with Milton's in "Areopagitica" on the *imprimatur.* But Culverwell sports with Selden's acceptance of Jewish claims to a monopoly on knowledge of the light of nature. Milton is after bigger game. Typically, too, there is far less of Culverwell present as he dogs along with bones of argument from Suarez or Grotius or whomever. The insubstantiality of Culverwell's life-world perhaps naturally leaves those he cites scarcely *present* at all, in contrast to the vigorous alternative selves thronging major English exposition from Latimer to Milton. And (to

paraphrase Stein) when you come to a *you* in Culverwell there isn't any you there.

Of course we may learn things from the minor figures of an era that we might not learn from its monuments. But will enough people wish to, to justify mobilizing a major press and standing orders and so on? "Reason not the need," some royal old Renaissance man may whisper. But surely in a time of thinning academic resources (and trees) it is no derogation of the editors' good work to suggest that the proper medium for the likes of Culverwell is microfiche, copies on demand.

GALE H. CARRITHERS, JR., *State University, Buffalo*

K. W. Grandsen, ed, *Tudor Verse Satire.* London, University of London: The Athlone Press, 1970. Pp. vi, 182. 18s

If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, one might indeed say that Mr. Grandsen's selections of verse satire and his introduction are a strong aperitif and appetite-builder, and not without the wherewithal to satisfy much of the hunger so induced. For this reviewer the writing of the review has been a process much longer than it might have been if there had been fewer enticements to ponder some of the introduction's insights and perceptions, and less interest aroused to reread the selections and even some of the attendant bibliography.

The inclusions are good. As the commentary on the back cover attests, there are many full length satires, and where it has been feasible to give only a partial reading, this is usually a "substantial extract." To those teaching a course in Renaissance satire the book will be especially welcome because of its making available the many obscure middle-to-late-century poems heretofore so difficult to obtain in quantity: the satires of Lodge, Guilpin, Rowlands, Weever, and Breton. One always cries for more, of course, and this reader would have liked to see also some "substantial extracts" from Heywood's "Spider and the Fly," from Skelton's earlier poems, and William Roy's "Rede Mee and Bee not Wroth" (so readily comparable with Skelton's Wolsey poems). Even a little of Rankin and a touch of the tedious Hake might have rounded out background for the greater figures – though many of these names do appear, and with apt description, in the introduction.

If only one of Skelton's long poems against Wolsey could be accommodated in this slim volume, *Colin Clout* is surely the best choice, since *Speke Parrot* would have required prolific annotation, and *Why Cam Ye Not to Court* is shrill and strident. And Skelton's *Colin,* moreover, is good preparative for Spenser's *Colin Clout's Come Home Again,* also included, along with a goodly third of *Mother Hubbard's Tale* – the middle third, and so including the eighty lines of non-satiric description of the good and "rightful courtier."

There are other couplings and interrelations: Guilpin's Satire V from the *Skialetheia* is a thin echo of Donne's First Satire (not included, but mentioned and quoted in the introduction and notes – pp. 14 and 176); and both Drant's and Ben Jonson's translations of Horace, Satires II, i are given, as is also Wyatt's paraphrasing of II, vi. Of disparate elements in the satires the editor is also aware. For illustration, for instance, of John Peter's distinction between complaint and satire, one is guided, on the one hand, to Skelton, Spenser and the anonymous *Cock Lorrell's Boat,* and on the other, to Donne and Marston and Hall. For a kind of satire Grandsen calls "reflective," the reader is led to Donne's and Jonson's verse letters. These are more Horatian in tone than Juvenalian, but the editor can point to